REMARKS

The specification has been amended. A new figure 5 has been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 11 and 12 remain in the application. Reconsideration and reexamination is respectfully requested.

In paper 8, the drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of claims 1 and 2. Applicant traverses. The second sentence of 37 CFR 1.83(a) specifies that detailed illustration that is not essential for proper understanding of the invention should be illustrated by a graphical symbol such as a labeled box. Applicant has provided such a symbol, with detailed description in the text of the specification. Without conceding that additional illustration is necessary for proper understanding of the invention, a new figure 5 has been added showing every feature of claims 1 and 2. No new matter has been added.

In paper 8, the drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of claims 11 and 12. Applicant traverses. Drawings are not required for process or method claims. See MPEP 601.01(f).

In paper 8, claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC 112 as allegedly not enabled by the specification. Applicant traverses. From the specification, page 10, lines 20-26, owned lines may be removed from the GOTL (at which point they are no longer owned). Once evicted, a line is no longer owned, and ownership accordingly changes.

In paper 8, claims 1-2 and 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,655,103 (Cheng *et al.*). Applicant traverses.

Claim 1 specifies a list containing an address reference for every line in the plurality of memory caches for which the corresponding line in memory may not be identical. Cheng *et al.* do not teach or suggest a list containing an address reference for every line in the plurality of memory caches for which the corresponding line in memory may not be identical. In Cheng *et al.*, entries in the dependency table are created only in the event of a miss. In column 6, the requested line is owned by CPU 102, and is in a modified state (is not identical to the corresponding line in memory), but an entry in the dependency table is created only after CPU 101 requests the line.

– 4 –

Regarding claim 2, Cheng *et al.* merely refer to an address with no further variation. In the examiner's remarks regarding claim 2, the definition of a tag is not correct.

Regarding claim 6, Cheng *et al.* do not teach or suggest anything other than a single dependency table. The examiner's remarks regarding local copies in Cheng *et al.* have no support in Cheng *et al.*

Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested. This application is considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

by _A. W. Winfield_

Augustus W. Winfield

Reg. No. 34,046

October 22, 2003

Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599

(970)-898-3142

- 5 -